<div align="center">

REMARKS

</div>

Claims 1-10, 12-37 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 16, 23 and 33 have been amended and claim 29 has been cancelled as shown on pages 2-8 of the Reply. The below comments present in greater detail distinctive features of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner over the telephone on November 12, 2007.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   Rejection of Claims 1-10 and 12-37 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7, 12-31 and 34-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conklin (US 6,415,283) in view of Risvik (US 6,377,945) further in view of Vishik (US 7,162,480). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Neither Conklin nor Risvik, teach or suggest all limitations of the subject claims.

> To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art and not based on the Applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant's claimed invention relates to architecture for generating meaningful names for a flattened data structure. By observing user activity associated with a hierarchical data structure, the system generates meaningful names that help to simplify browsing of computer network shares. In particular, amended independent claim 1 recites *a computer implemented system that facilitates the generation of meaningful description for a flattened data structure,*

*comprising a data structure having a plurality of data nodes and **a description component that generates a description that represents at least one of the one or more data nodes that is selected according to the metric, wherein a first set of meaningful names is generated for a first user and a second set of meaningful names is generated for a second user, the first and second sets of meaningful names are generated from the same data structure.*** Independent claims 16, 23 and 33 recite similar features. Conklin, Risvik and Vishik, either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest such novel aspects of applicant's claimed invention.

Conklin discloses a cluster processing system that determines at least one focal node on a hierarchically arranged tree structure of nodes based on attributes of a data set. At page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Conklin discloses such novel features. Applicant's representative avers to the contrary. In accordance with the claimed invention, the description component generates meaningful names for the selected data nodes. The names generated for different users will be different, but from the same data structure. At the cited portions, Conklin discloses a weight summing method for use in the clustering technique. However, Conklin is silent regarding ***a description component that generates a description that represents at least one of the one or more data nodes that is selected according to the metric, wherein a first set of meaningful names is generated for a first user and a second set of meaningful names is generated for a second user, the first and second sets of meaningful names are generated from the same data structure*** as recited by the subject claims. The Examiner tries to compensate for the aforementioned deficiencies of Conklin with Risvik and Vishik.

Risvik relates to a search system for information retrieval in large volumes of data. At the cited portions, Risvik discloses a system that matches words or symbols in a query with the words or symbols in a text by utilizing an edit distance metric. The edit distance metric is the calculated minimum sum of costs for edit operations performed, for transforming a word s in the text to a word q in the query. However, Risvik is silent regarding the aforementioned deficiencies of Conklin does not teach *a first set of meaningful names generated for a first user and a second set of meaningful names generated for a second user, the first and second sets of meaningful names are generated from the same data structure.*

Vishik relates to organization of information for retrieval and to a usage-based adaptable taxonomy. However, Vishik is silent regarding *a first set of meaningful names generated for a*

first user and a second set of meaningful names generated for a second user, the first and second sets of meaningful names are generated from the same data structure.

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Conklin, Risvik and Vishik, either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the applicant's subject claims.   Accordingly it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP639US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731